



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,837	02/23/2004	Yukiko Takeda	HITA.0506	5428
38327	7590	11/05/2009		
Juan Carlos A. Marquez c/o Stites & Harbison PLLC 1199 North Fairfax Street Suite 900 Alexandria, VA 22314-1437				
EXAMINER				
KANE, CORDELLA P				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2432				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/05/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/782,837

**Applicant(s)**

TAKEDA ET AL.

**Examiner**

CORDELIA KANE

**Art Unit**

2432

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-6,8-11,16 and 17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-6,8-11,16 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 21, 2009 has been entered.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4 – 6, 8 – 11, 16 and 17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 1, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nikander's US Publication 2002/0133607 A1, in view of Turner and further in view of "IPv6 Prefix Options for DHCPv6" (November 2002).
5. Referring to claim 1, Nikander teaches:
- A processor for issuing and guaranteeing public key certification (page 3, paragraph 43).

- b. A memory for holding prefix allocation allow/prohibit information of a terminal device, the prefix allocation allow/prohibit information indicating whether allocation of a prefix is allowed or prohibited (pages 7-8, paragraph 141).
  - c. Receiving a public key issue certification request, issuing a public key certification of said terminal device and sent to the terminal (pages 8-9, paragraph 161).
  - d. A communications interface for rewriting said prefix allocation allow/prohibit information (page 10, paragraph 232).
  - e. Communicating with a prefix allocation function (page 4, paragraph 48).
6. Nikander does not explicitly disclose searching the prefix allocation allow/prohibit information. However, Turner discloses searching prefix information (column 5, lines 35-36). Nikander and Turner are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, routing data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Nikander and Turner before him or her, to modify prefix allocation of Nikander to include the searching of Turner. The motivation for doing so would have been that the scaling issues with prefixes require a more complex lookup (column 2, lines 54-55).
7. Nikander in view of Turner does not explicitly disclose the terminal control device has a DHCP-PD function and allocates prefix information using the DHCP-PD function. However, IPv6 discloses using DHCP for prefix delegation (page 1). Nikander, Turner and IPv6 are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, routing data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art, having the teachings of Nikander in view of Turner and IPv6 before him or her, to modify the prefix allocation of Nikander in view of Turner to include the DHCP of IPv6. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been DHCP is the internet standard.

8. Referring to claim 17, Nikander teaches the terminal creates a home address from the prefix information and the terminal interface identifier (page 2, paragraph 11).

9. Claims 4 – 6, 8, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nikander's US Publication 2002/0133607 A1, and further in view of "IPv6 Prefix Options for DHCPv6" (November 2002).

10. Referring to claim 4, Nikander teaches:

- f. Communicating with a server device containing a function to issue and guarantee public key certification (pages 8-9, paragraph 161) and prefix allocation allow prohibit information which indicates whether allocation of a prefix is allowed or prohibited (page 10, paragraph 232).
- g. A transceiver for acquiring public key certification (page 9, paragraph 162).
- h. A routine to maintain security by utilizing IPsec technology (page 1, paragraph 2), and storage to store a terminal device location information (page 4, paragraph 48).

- i. Information confirming the identity of the terminal device is received (page 4, paragraph 48), and a public key certification is acquired (pages 8-9, paragraph 161).
  - j. Wherein information allowing prefix allocation for said terminal device is loaded from said server device and if said server device approves allocation of a prefix to said terminal device, then prefix information is reported to the terminal device (page 4, paragraph 48).
  - k. Creating a home address from the prefix information and the terminal interface identifier (page 2, paragraph 11)
11. Nikander does not explicitly disclose the terminal control device has a DHCP-PD function and allocates prefix information using the DHCP-PD function. However, IPv6 discloses using DHCP for prefix delegation (page 1). Nikander, and IPv6 are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, routing data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Nikander and IPv6 before him or her, to modify the prefix allocation of Nikander to include the DHCP of IPv6. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been DHCP is the internet standard.
12. Referring to claim 5, Nikander teaches:
- l. An information processing device having a prefix allocation function (pages 7-8, paragraph 141).
  - m. Information confirming the identity of said terminal is received from said terminal device (page 4, paragraph 48).

- n. An inquiry for prefix information is made to said information processing device (pages 7-8, paragraph 141).
  - o. A reply to the inquiry indicative that said prefix was allocated is made from the information processing device, then a reply confirming the identity of the terminal is sent to the terminal device (page 8, paragraph 142).
13. Referring to claim 6, Nikander teaches that the security information is compared and if it matches then there is a binding update (page 10, paragraphs 232).
14. Referring to claim 8, Nikander teaches:
- p. A server device that issues a public key certificate and rewrites prefix allocation information (page 3, paragraph 43, page 10, paragraph 232).
  - q. An information processor receives prefix allocation request and makes an inquiry for allow/prohibit information and allocates prefix information to said terminal device, the prefix allocation allow/prohibit information indicating whether allocation of a prefix is allowed or prohibited (pages 7-8, paragraph 141).
  - r. A terminal control device that receives information confirming the identity of the terminal device and sends prefix information to said information processor device (page 4, paragraph 48).
  - s. The information processing device establishes a security association between the terminal device and the terminal control device (page 10, paragraph 232).
  - t. Creating a home address from the prefix information and the terminal interface identifier (page 2, paragraph 11)

15. Nikander does not explicitly disclose the terminal control device has a DHCP-PD function and allocates prefix information using the DHCP-PD function. However, IPv6 discloses using DHCP for prefix delegation (page 1). Nikander, and IPv6 are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, routing data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Nikander and IPv6 before him or her, to modify the prefix allocation of Nikander to include the DHCP of IPv6. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been DHCP is the internet standard.

16. Referring to claim 11, Nikander teaches:

- u. Said terminal device communicates with the server device holding the public key certification information (pages 8-9, paragraph 161).
- v. Said information processing device sends prefix information to the terminal device (page 4, paragraph 48).

17. Claims 9 and 10 rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being obvious over Nikander in view of "IPv6 Prefix Options for DHCPv6" (November 2002) and further in view of Wada.

18. Nikander in view of IPv6 discloses all the limitations of the parent claim as well as:

- w. That the terminal control device receives a location registration request from the terminal device, loads the security association (Nikander, pages 7-8, paragraph 141)



- x. That the terminal control device approves the location registration when the registration request fulfills the security association (Nikander, page 8, paragraph 142)
19. Nikander in view of IPv6 does not explicitly disclose a communications device between the home and visiting network. However, Wada discloses a gateway between the home and visiting networks (Figure 15, column 27, lines 32-35). Since the prefix allocation request goes from the mobile node to the server, it inherently would go through the gateway.
20. Nikander in view of IPv6 and Wada are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, mobile roaming. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Nikander in view of IPv6 and Wada before him or her, to modify Nikander to include the gateway of Wada.
21. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being obvious over Akhtar in view of Nikander and further in view of IPv6.
22. Akhtar discloses :
- y. Powering on a terminal (column 43, lines 25-26).
  - z. Sending a router advertisement to the terminal from a visited network router (column 52, lines 4-5).
  - aa. Creating a care of address in the terminal (column 52, lines 16-17).
  - bb. Sending a device authentication request to the visited network router column 52, lines 5-6).

- cc. Sending a public key certification request with a public key and a terminal ID to a calling authority (column 43, lines 48-54).
  - dd. Issuing a public key certification issue response from the calling authority compatible with Ipv6 (column 44, lines 20-24).
  - ee. Establishing an IPsec security association and digital signature via IKE and a secure communication channel using phase I and phase II IPsec ISAKMP protocols between the terminal and the home agent server (column 18, lines 51-53).
  - ff. Making a location binding update in the terminal using the IPsec security association (column 51, lines 16-18).
  - gg. Thereby providing an authentication method for verifying a terminal authenticity by linking a digital signature method with a location binding update method (column 31, lines 18-27).
23. Akhtar does not explicitly disclose sending a request to verify the public key, then allocating the prefix, making a location binding update, and creating a home address. However, Nikander discloses:
- hh. Sending a request to check the public key certification to the calling authority (page 9, paragraph 200).
  - ii. Holding prefix allocation allow/prohibit information of a terminal device, the prefix allocation allow/prohibit information indicating whether allocation of a prefix is allowed or prohibited (pages 7-8, paragraph 141).

- jj. Responding from the calling authority server whether prefix allocation is allowed with a prefix and creating a home address in the terminal (page 10, paragraph 232).
  - kk. Making a location binding update by the terminal using a binding cache from the home agent server (page 10, paragraph 232).
  - ll. The terminal creates a home address from the prefix information and the terminal interface identifier (page 2, paragraph 11).
24. Akhtar and Nikander are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, roaming of mobile nodes. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Akhtar and Nikander before him or her, to modify Akhtar to include verifying the public key, allocating a prefix, and binding the location of Nikander. The motivation for doing so would have been to bind the interface identifier to the link layer address, and public key (page 4, paragraph 49-50).
25. Akhtar in view of Nikander does not explicitly disclose the terminal control device has a DHCP-PD function and allocates prefix information using the DHCP-PD function. However, IPv6 discloses using DHCP for prefix delegation (page 1). Akhtar in view of Nikander, and IPv6 are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, routing data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Akhtar in view of Nikander and IPv6 before him or her, to modify the prefix allocation of Akhtar in view of Nikander to include

the DHCP of IPv6. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been DHCP is the internet standard.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CORDELIA KANE whose telephone number is (571)272-7771. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8:00 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/782,837

Page 12

Art Unit: 2432

/Benjamin E Lanier/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2432